

VU Research Portal

Topic and Focus in Wambon discourse

de Vries, Lourens

published in

Syntax and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar
1985

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

de Vries, L. (1985). Topic and Focus in Wambon discourse. In M. Bolkestein (Ed.), *Syntax and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar* (pp. 155-180). Foris Publications.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

Syntax and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar

A.M. Bokestein

C. de Groot

J.L. Mackenzie (eds.)



1985

FORIS PUBLICATIONS

Dordrecht - Holland/Cinnaminson - U.S.A.

tributing the parts of the
and SOV:

ten
eur

the focus constituent
-placement of the thematic
struction is discussed
Klein and Van den Toorn

Chapter 11

Topic and focus in Wambon discourse

Lourens de Vries

Seksi Linguistik ZGK, Irian Jaya, Indonesia

0. Introduction

This article describes the behavior of switch-reference¹ and focal suffixes in Wambon², a Papuan tribal language spoken by about 3000 people in the southern Lowlands of Irian Jaya along the banks of the Upper-Digul river. The major claim of the article concerns the functionality of Topic and Focus (as defined in the Functional Grammar framework of Dik 1978, 1980a) in Wambon discourse: Topic and Focus mediate between discourse constraints of informational cohesion and the syntactic form of linguistic expressions.

In trying to relate the description of sentence-grammar phenomena to discourse-level phenomena I use some notions developed by Grimes (1975) on discourse-level, viz. identification span and strength of identification. Cohesion constraints connected with identification spans have to do with establishing, maintaining and re-establishing discourse-topics: for a discourse to be informationally cohesive the speaker should first establish a discourse-topic ('This is the entity I want to talk about') and then maintain and confirm it ('I am still talking about the same entity'). These discourse-topics form the points at which the Addressee integrates new information into his memory (Clark and Clark 1977: 95).

Switch-reference suffixes, triggered by the assignment of Topic, guide Wambon Addressees as to how expressions fit into the development of discourse-topicality³ in the preceding discourse. Same-Subject suffixes indicate that the Speaker is still maintaining a previously well-established discourse-topic. Different-Subject suffixes indicate that there will be a change of contextual perspective from one well-established discourse-topic to another well-established discourse-topic. Wambon distinguishes formally two types of Topic: Strong Topics and Weak Topics. Strong Topics have to do with the act of establishing a topic, whereas Weak Topics have to do with maintaining a previously well-established topic.

A Speaker should make clear not only what he is talking about (the dimension of discourse-topicality) but also which information changes the pragmatic information of the Addressee most crucially (the dimension of discourse-saliency). Wambon focal suffixes, triggered by Focus-assignment, guide the Addressee as to how expressions fit into the development of saliency in the preceding discourse.

In this way Focus codes saliency constraints onto the form of linguistic expressions.

The article has the following structure: Section 1 contains theoretical preliminaries concerning the definition of pragmatic functions (1.1.) and concerning the notions of topical span, strong and weak topicality and strength of identification (1.2.); Section 2 deals with Topic in Wambon, 2.1. dealing with Weak Topics and switch-reference, 2.2. with Strong Topics and their expression; Section 3 is about Focus in Wambon with 3.2. giving special attention to the relation between Topic and Focus; and Section 4 presents some conclusions.

1. Theoretical preliminaries

1.1. Defining pragmatic functions

If we keep defining pragmatic functions on the level of general theory and in terms of informational roles only, we will be defining and redefining them eternally. I propose the following limitations on the definitions of pragmatic functions:

- (i) start by defining pragmatic functions on the level of individual languages; this provides a sound basis for a typologically adequate characterization of these functions in general theory.
- (ii) define pragmatic functions also in terms of the expressive devices used to express them, and not only in terms of informational statuses or roles.

Along these lines the definition of pragmatic functions would be firmly tied to the 'emic' distinctions languages themselves make, which is a typological advantage. A second advantage is the reduction in the vagueness of the definitions because the definitions also refer to the expressive devices used. Thus Topic in L is not only defined as the constituent presenting information the Speaker wants to predicate something about (informational status) but also as the constituent in linguistic expressions which attracts the suffix *s* or the position *p* or the construction *c* (expressive devices).

An interesting consequence of this approach is that the definitions of pragmatic functions in individual languages differ not only in terms of the expressive devices used (which is to be expected) but also in terms of the informational roles associated with the pragmatic functions: different languages appear to make different 'emic' distinctions in the areas of topicality and saliency. Languages like Wambon do not subdivide the saliency dimension into several types of saliency

on the level of sentence area of saliency, thus causing the various typinguishes for example with a previous assertion different pragmatic conditions differ in both expression and Wambon distinguish the same expressive devices

If we define pragmatic on the level of the construction of conceptual structure (1982: 199) defines the most concrete level differences among natural principle, which protects irrelevant and empirically becoming a trivial enumeration abstract theory of pragmatic fines pragmatic function linguistic expressions, concrete to capture the defining pragmatic function formation roles and to arrive at concrete and us to compare individuals theory of pragmatic function

1.2. Some discourse notions
Discourse-constraints (1975: 92) notions of defines these notions a series of identification clauses, in which strength of identification Washington Carver to generator in Arkansas

on the level of sentence-grammar: Wambon uses the same formal means for the whole area of saliency, thus neutralizing differences in the pragmatic conditions causing the various types of saliency. Aghem, on the other hand (see 3.1.), distinguishes for example saliency caused by newness from saliency caused by contrast with a previous assertion by treating the salient constituents differently in the different pragmatic conditions. Thus the definitions of Focus in Aghem and Wambon differ in both expressive devices and informational roles involved. On the other hand Wambon distinguishes formally two types of Topic where other languages use the same expressive device for the whole area of topicality.

If we define pragmatic functions along the lines proposed here, we define them on the level of the constituents of linguistic expressions and not on the level of conceptual structures as proposed by De Schutter and Nuyts (1983: 393). Dik (1982: 199) defines the optimal level of abstractness of linguistic theory as the most concrete level at which it is still possible to capture the typological differences among natural languages. This is a very important methodological principle, which protects linguistic theory on the one hand from losing itself in irrelevant and empirically almost empty abstractions and on the other hand from becoming a trivial enumeration of facts. Any proposal in the direction of a more abstract theory of pragmatic functions than the theory of Dik (1978), which defines pragmatic functions on the relatively concrete level of constituents of linguistic expressions, should make clear first of all that that theory is too concrete to capture the typological differences among natural languages. By defining pragmatic functions on the level of constituents in terms of both the informational roles and the expressive characteristics of these constituents we can arrive at concrete and concise definitions of pragmatic functions, which enable us to compare individual languages, thus making a typological sound general theory of pragmatic functions possible.

1.2. Some discourse notions

Discourse-constraints on topical cohesion can be formulated in terms of Grimes' (1975: 92) notions of strength of identification and identification span. Grimes defines these notions as follows (1975: 92): 'An identification span consists of a series of identifications of the same participant, not necessarily in contiguous clauses, in which no identification is stronger than the one before it. Strength of identification is a ranking that goes from proper names like *George Washington Carver* to explicit descriptives like *the mechanic who fixed our generator in Arkansas* to common nouns like *the teacher* to nouns used generically

form of linguistic express-
contains theoretical pre-
sions (1.1.) and concerning
and strength of identifi-
1.1. Dealing with Weak
their expression; Section
ention to the relation
conclusions.

general theory and in
and redefining them eter-
tions of pragmatic func-

of individual languages;
adequate characterization

pressive devices used to
al statuses or roles.

would be firmly tied to
is a typological advan-
less of the definitions
ices used. Thus Topic in
ormation the Speaker wants
also as the constituent
the position p or the

the definitions of prag-
in terms of the express-
terms of the informational
t languages appear to make
y and saliency. Languages
o several types of saliency

like the *fellow* to pronouns like *him*, and from there to reference without identification.'

To facilitate the description of Wambon in terms of the Functional Grammar model I insert the notion of Topic into this definition: a topical span consists of a series of identifications of the same Topic, not necessarily in contiguous clauses, in which no identification is stronger than the one before it. Furthermore, I make a distinction between discourse-topics and sentence-topics. Sentence-topics are discourse-topics that have been formally expressed as Topics by the expression rules of sentence-grammar.

To illustrate the idea of topical span analysis consider the following stretch of discourse from English:

- (1) A: Yesterday I met your brother John
- (2) A: He looked very pale
- (3) B: Yes, he has not been well for a couple of weeks now
- (4) A: John had better consult a doctor the way he looks

(1)-(4) contains two topical spans with *John* as the discourse-topic. In (1) this topic is introduced by the strong identification *your brother John*. In (2) this topic is treated as a well-established topic and it is given a weak identification by *he*. In the same way the topic is maintained in (3) by weak, pronominal identification. In (4) the topic is re-established by the identification *John*, which is stronger than the one before it (*he* in (3)); thus a new topical span is started with the same topic.

Usually there is a gradual decrease in strength of identification from the beginning of a topical span towards the end. Initially in topical spans, the Speaker uses as much identification as is needed given the pragmatic information of the Addressee. Medially and finally in topical spans the Speaker uses as little identification as possible while still maintaining the discourse-topic. Every now and then the Speaker will, in the middle of a topical span, give insufficient identification of a topic (because of over-estimating the pragmatic information of the Addressee), which is then corrected by a marked strong identification finally in the topical span, resulting in a Predication, Tail-construction like (5):

- (5) She is a beautiful woman, your sister

WAMBON DISCOURSE

There are at least two types of identification of a topic: a strong identification of a topic, as in (5) *your sister* in (5) finally in a topical span; and a weak identification of a topic, as in (6) *the use of a stroke* in (6) *the use of a stroke*. Consider (6):

- (6) a. Ronald Reagan
- b. He reminded me of the President
- c. The President's influence

The use of the stroke in (6) is a weak identification of a topic, as in (6) *the use of a stroke* in (6) *the use of a stroke*. Speaker was talking about the use of a stroke in (6c).

Generally, identification of a topic is not necessarily held by the Speaker, sometimes favor of the demand for identification. Although formally in (6b) (*he*), functioning strategies by the Speaker. The repetition in newspaper and in (6c) (*he*), functioning strategies by the Speaker.

This second case follows: a topical span, not necessarily stronger than the stylistic strategy: Strongly identified of establishing the occurring medially.

reference without iden-

the Functional Grammar
: : a topical span consists
necessarily in contiguous
one before it. Fur-
and sentence-topics.
nally expressed as Topics

ider the following stretch

now
ks

course-topic. In (1) this
brother John. In (2) this
given a weak identifica-
(3) by weak, pronominal
the identification John,
us a new topical span is

identification from the
in topical spans, the
the pragmatic information
the Speaker uses as
g the discourse-topic.
topical span, give in-
estimating the pragmatic
by a marked strong iden-
predication, Tail-con-

There are at least two cases in which, within one topical span, an identification of a topic is stronger than the one before it, resulting in a strong-weak-strong identification sequence. The first case concerns the usage of *Tails* like *your sister* in (5), which we discussed above. This use of a strong expression finally in a topical span is clearly connected with identificational strategies. The second case concerns strong expressions which contain markedly more descriptive information than is needed for identificational purposes. In these cases the use of a strong expression is not at all connected with identification. Consider (6):

- (6) a. Ronald Reagan again stressed the importance of a strong NATO
- b. He reminded his European guests of what the Russians were doing in Afghanistan and he brought the situation in Poland to their attention
- c. The President furthermore expressed his worries about the growing influence of pacifism in Western Europe

The use of the strong expression *the President* in (6c) is a clear case of identificational redundancy. If the weak pronominal identification *he* had been used instead of *the President* in (6c), it would have been perfectly clear who the Speaker was talking about. The Ronald Reagan topical span, started in (6a), is continued in (6c).

Generally, identificational redundancy will be unacceptable as it will '... unnecessarily hold up the course of the communicative interaction' (Dik 1978: 55). However, sometimes the demands of identificational efficiency are ignored in favor of the demands of stylistic variety, and this is what happens in (6c). Although formally *the President* is a strong identification, following a weak one in (6b) (*he*), functionally this strong expression is not used as part of referring strategies but as part of style strategies aimed at keeping readers interested. The repetitive use of weak pronominal identification is especially avoided in newspaper and broadcasting language.

This second case leads us to modify the definition of topical span given above as follows: a topical span consists of a series of identifications of the same Topic, not necessarily in contiguous clauses, in which no identification is stronger than the one before it, unless the strong expression is used as part of stylistic strategies of variation and not as part of referring strategies.⁴

Strongly identified Topics occurring initially in topical spans in the phase of establishing topicality, I will label Strong Topics. Weakly identified Topics occurring medially and finally in topical spans in the phase of maintaining

topicality, I will call *Weak Topics*. Wambon as we will see below formally distinguishes these two types of Topics by applying different expression-rules to them.

2. Topic in Wambon

2.1. Weak Topics

2.1.1. Switch-reference morphology

Compare (7) and (8):

- (7) Nukhe oye hetag-mbelo topkeka-lepo
 I pig see-SS flee-past1sgfinal
 'I saw a pig and I fled'
- (8) Nukhe oye hetakha-levo topkeka-tbo
 I pig see-NF1sgDS flee-past3sgfinal
 'I saw a pig and it fled'
 (NF = non-future)

Both (7) and (8) consist of two clauses. In (7) both clauses have the same Subject (*nukhe*, 'I'). In (8) the second clause has a different Subject from the first clause. Wambon, like many other Papuan and some American Indian languages, uses a system of verbal suffixes to signal sameness or change of Subject with regard to the following clause. If the Subject of the following clause has a different referent from the Subject of the preceding clause, Different-Subject (DS) suffixes appear on the verb of the preceding clause (e.g. *-levo* in (8)). If the Subject stays the same, Same-Subject (SS) suffixes appear on the verb (e.g. *-mbelo* in (7)). This monitoring of subjects in consecutive clauses is commonly called switch-reference (SR) (see Reesink 1983a for an overview).

Connected with switch-reference phenomena is the distinction between final and medial verbs. Final verbs (like *topkekalepo* in (7)) occur only in the last clause of a sentence. They cannot be marked for SS or DS; they are independent verbs, i.e. they can stand on their own and are not dependent on other verbs for the interpretation of their tense and other verb-bound categories. Medial verbs occur only in non-final clauses; they must carry SR-morphology and they are dependent on the final verbs for their tense and person/number interpretation.

To carry the SR-monitoring of Subjects across sentence-boundaries the final verb of the preceding sentence is typically repeated as the first verb of the following sentence. This repeated verb being medial, it is obligatorily marked for SS or DS. In this way the SR-monitoring of two sentence-domains is linked.

Medial verbs come in three sorts: participle SS-verbs, finite SS-verbs and

WAMBON DISCOURSE

finite DS-verbs. Part. are morphologically v with the optional add. mainly as repeated fi. They are derived from final forms; the repe. functions also as the Non-Future (NF) and F. When the final verb consists of the Past-

- levo NF1sgDS
- lo NF2/3sgD
- levano NF1plDS
- leno NF2/3plDS

When the tense of the Present, the DS-verb

- vo F1sgDS
- no F2/3sgDS
- vano F1plDS
- nano F2/3plDS

Sentences in Wambon long series of rather pressed but identified ships with these long 'clause chaining'), f) (1983a: 226) remark t) medial verbs as a case make it more understandable any semantic relation Grimes 1975 calls it) However, from a syntactic coordination not primary final clauses because number and tense inter-

! see below formally distinct expression-rules to them.

finite DS-verbs. Participle SS-verbs are the most frequent medial verbs; they are morphologically very simple as they consist of the stem of the Present tense with the optional addition of the SS suffix *-mbelo* or *-lo*. Finite SS-verbs occur mainly as repeated final verbs after sentence-boundaries to link SR-domains. They are derived from the final verb forms by adding the SS suffix *-o* to the final forms; the repeated final verb mostly occurs in the Present tense, which functions also as the Neutral tense. Finite DS-verbs can express only two tenses, Non-Future (NF) and Future (F).

When the final verb of the sentence has Past or Present tense the DS-verb consists of the Past-stem plus the following suffixes:

- levo NF1sgDS
- lo NF2/3sgDS
- levano NF1plDS
- leno NF2/3plDS

clauses have the same Subject
t Subject from the first
can Indian languages, uses a
a of Subject with regard to
clause has a different ref-
rent-Subject (DS) suffixes
p in (8)). If the Subject
the verb (e.g. *-mbelo* in
ses is commonly called
(ew).

distinction between final and
occur only in the last clause
ny are independent verbs,
on other verbs for the in-
ories. Medial verbs occur
ogy and they are dependent
nterpretation.

nce-boundaries the final
s the first verb of the
t is obligatorily marked
tence-domains is linked.
bs, finite SS-verbs and

When the tense of the final verb is Future, Uncertain Future or Intentional Present, the DS-verb consists of the Future-stem plus the following suffixes:

- vo F1sgDS
- no F2/3sgDS
- vano F1plDS
- nano F2/3plDS

Sentences in Wambon, especially in narrative discourse, typically consist of long series of rather simply structured clauses with the Subjects often not expressed but identified by SR-monitoring. As regards the interclausal relationships with these long sequences of clauses (Reesink 1983a: 226 speaks of 'clause chaining'), from a semantic point of view one can agree with Reesink's (1983a: 226) remark that '...I prefer to see "clause chaining" with the help of medial verbs as a case of coordination, rather than as subordination. This would make it more understandable that clauses in such sequences can stand in almost any semantic relation to each other, because addition, or "collection" (as Grimes 1975 calls it) is the most neutral semantic relationship.'

However, from a syntactic point of view - and is the distinction subordination/coordination not primarily a syntactic one? - medial clauses are subordinated to final clauses because medial verbs are dependent on final verbs for their person/number and tense interpretation. Even medial DS-verbs which express person and

number independently of their final verbs, have two distinct subordinative qualities:

(i) they can express only two tenses whereas final verbs can express all the five Wambon tenses; this neutralization of verb-bound morphological categories is typical of verbs in subordinated domains, whereas verbs in independent clauses typically express the full range of these oppositions;

(ii) the choice of these two tenses in medial DS-verbs depends on the tense of the final verb, as we have seen above.

Furthermore final clauses can occur all by themselves, whereas medial clauses cannot; medial clauses depend on final ones.

2.1.2. Topicality and switch-reference

Reesink (1983a: 240, 242) has argued that topicality factors play an important role in the SR-mechanisms of several Papuan languages. Above I have formulated the distribution of SS and DS suffixes in Wambon in terms of the notion of Subject; and indeed this formulation is valid as long as one takes isolated sentences as data. However, when one starts to study the SR-mechanism as it operates in discourse, the notion of Topic appears to be crucially involved in the distribution of SR-morphology (see Dik 1978: 141 for this notion of Topic). Consider the following stretch of discourse, taken from a travel narrative, in which the Speaker⁵ tells about a journey he made a year ago. On the way he met some men, from whom he had tried to buy sago:

- (9) jakhove : 'woyo, ndune tembet!' nde-leno
 they : 'No, sago not be say-NF3pIDS
 'They said: 'No, there is no sago...'
 (10) et-mbelo epka nda-gndev-o
 leave-behind-SS there come-pres1sgSS
 '... (and) leaving (them) behind there I travelled on ...'
 (11) sale inolapngelimō
 sun go down (SS) (present tense stem)
 '...till the sun went down'
 (12) ot numbum-ke-tbo
 stomach empty-become-past3sgfinal
 '... (and) (my) stomach felt empty (I got hungry)'

In the transition from clause (9) to (10) the switch of Subject (from *jakhove* in (9) to the 1sg Subject identified in (10) by person/number suffix only) is reflected in the -leno NF3pIDS suffix on the verb in (9). In the transition from (10) to (11) there is a switch of Subject (to *sale*, 'the sun', in (11)) but the

WAMBON DISCOURSE

verb in (10) carries a because the Subject of

The 'false' SS-mark lows: every time there clause presents inform course-topic, the 'false' occur whenever the Sub example 'the sun' in (a topic; 'the sun' does the Subject of (10), 'topic. The 'I'-topic of The SR-mechanism in discourse-topics media which (9)-(12) is a travel narrative as fo.

- (13) Koiwo-talome n
 last-year I
 'Last year I t
 (TN = transitiv

Since this initial int by person/number suffi to find a topic mainta: tablishing takes place. a typical characterist:

Different Subject m refers to a different notion of Subject is not simply occur whenever but only when there is essentially involved b change of Subjects bet change of SubjectTopic

False SS-markings ar rather frequent in Wamb clauses preceding a tin event, such as (11). Th

distinct subordinative qual-

verbs can express all the morphological categories verbs in independent clauses

depends on the tense of

, whereas medial clauses

factors play an important

Above I have formulated

arms of the notion of Sub-

one takes isolated sen-

SR-mechanism as it operates

ally involved in the distri-

tion of Topic). Consider

l narrative, in which the

the way he met some men,

elled on ...'

y)'

of Subject (from jakhove in

umber suffix only) is re-

. In the transition from

the sun', in (11)) but the

verb in (10) carries an SS-marking. Another 'false' SS-marking occurs in (11), because the Subject of (12), *ot*, 'stomach', is different from that of (11).

The 'false' SS-markings in Wambon narrative discourse can be explained as follows: every time there is a change of Subject, but the Subject of the following clause presents information that is not previously well-established as a discourse-topic, the 'false' SS-markings occur. That is, the 'false' SS-markings occur whenever the Subject of the following clause is not a Weak Topic. For example 'the sun' in (11) has not been established in the preceding discourse as a topic; 'the sun' does not occur medially in a topical span. On the other hand the Subject of (10), 'I', refers to a previously well-established discourse-topic. The 'I'-topic occurs medially in a topical span, and is a maintained topic.

The SR-mechanism in Wambon is connected with keeping track of or maintaining discourse-topics medially in topical spans. In the first clause of the story of which (9)-(12) is a part the Speaker had introduced himself as the topic of the travel narrative as follows:

- (13) Koiwo-talome nukhe Mboma ka-lepo-n-o
last-year I Boma go-past1sg-TN-SS
'Last year I travelled to Boma ...'
(TN = transitional nasal)

Since this initial introduction in (13) the 'I'-topic has been identified only by person/number suffixes and SR-morphology on the verbs. It is not all uncommon to find a topic maintained this way throughout dozens of clauses before re-establishing takes place. The occurrence of very long topical spans is certainly a typical characteristic of Wambon narrative discourse.

Different Subject markings occur when the Subject of the following clause refers to a different Weak Topic from the Subject of the preceding clause. The notion of Subject is essentially involved in the SR rules because DS-markings do not simply occur whenever there is a change of Weak Topics between two clauses, but only when there is a change of *SubjectTopic*. The notion of Topic is also essentially involved because DS-markings do not occur simply whenever there is a change of Subjects between two consecutive clauses but only when there is a change of *SubjectTopic* constituents.

False SS-markings are not at all rare exceptions; on the contrary they are rather frequent in Wambon texts. The most frequent 'false' SS-markings occur in clauses preceding a time-clause which specifies the temporal background of an event, such as (11). The Subjects of such temporal clauses ('the morning came',

'when the evening fell', 'till the sun went down', 'when the morning bird sang') are never well-established discourse-topics. And because of this there is no change of SubjTop but only of Subj in the transitions into and out of these time-setting clauses. The same holds for predications about the weather ('the rain came down') and experiential clauses ('the stomach gave me an empty feeling'). The Subjects of these temporal, meteorological and experiential clauses are never Weak Topics and this fact explains the occurrence of the SS-marking in clauses preceding them.

However, 'false' SS-markings are not restricted to these three types of clauses, which typically have non-human and inanimate Subjects, but they also occur preceding clauses with human Subjects which have not been previously established as topics. Consider the following example, also taken from a travel narrative; the travelling party (the 'we'-topic) arrives by canoe at the village Bi on the Upper-Digul river:

- (14) hitulovo-sale lavi-lo ko-gndeva-n-o
fourth-day go down-SS go-pres1pl-TN-SS
'On Thursday we travelled down(-river)....'
- (15) Mbi-kambom-nga te-mbelo tu-lo
Bi-village-loc tie-SS go up-SS
'... (and) in the village Bi we tied (our canoes) and went up
(the river-bank)'
- (16) ola na ep-kuva nokho-nela mba-khe-kot
and PM there-also our-brother-in-law stay-pres3sg-perf
'...and there our brother-in-law stayed already...'
- (17) tu-lo ep-ka
go up-SS there-loc
'...there we went up (the river-bank)'
(PM = pause marker)

In (15) the verbs carry-SS markings because the Subject of (16), *nokhonela*, has not been established as a discourse-topic in the preceding discourse. It is not a Weak Topic. In fact in (16) the weak discourse-topic is the same as in (14) and (15), viz. the travelling party referred to as 'we', which is identified in (16) by the possessive prefix *nokho-* and in all other clauses by person/number and SR suffixation.

An interesting class of 'false' SS-markings is formed by cases where the Subject switches in number only, from 1pl to 1sg and back, but also from 2 and 3sg to 2 and 3pl and back. Consider the following stretch of discourse:

WAMBON DISCOURSE

- (18) la-levambo-n-
sleep-past1pl
'...and we sl
- (19) Mbulungop ka-
Burunggop go-
'... (and) I w
- (20) Kwoip-ka mba
there-loc sta
'There I stay
- (21) kwoip-ka mba
there-loc sta
'...there we
- (22) osakha hali s
and day M
'...and on Mc

From (18) to (19) the shift back from the 1 again a shift from 1f carry SS-markings. It set of participants t the set and back are Generally in Wambo of reference, i.e. 'I ever, in the data whi which a number-shift by DS suffixation. Cc travel story as (14)-

- (23) nukhe eve non
I STM STM
'...and as fā
- (24) kinum-ngup-ma
sleep-with-ve
'...till I be
- (25) ep-ka la-
there-loc sle
'There I slep
- (26) nduno ene-mo-
sago eat-du
'...and we we
(STM = strong

the morning bird sang')
 of this there is no
 to and out of these time-

he weather ('the rain
 me an empty feeling').

idental clauses are never
 SS-marking in clauses

ese three types of
 bjects, but they also
 ot been previously es-
 o taken from a travel
 by canoe at the village

and went up

g-perf
 ...

of (16), nokhanela, has
 ng discourse. It is not
 s the same as in (14)
 which is identified in
 auses by person/number

by cases where the Sub-
 but also from 2 and 3sg
 discourse:

(18) la-levambo-n-o jat-ke-lo
 sleep-past1pl-TN-SS day-become-SS
 '...and we slept till the day came ...'

(19) Mbulungop ka-lepo
 Burunggop go-past1sgfinal
 '...(and) I went to Burunggop'

(20) Kwoip-ka mba-gndev-o minggu hane
 there-loc stay-pres1sg-SS week one
 'There I stayed one week ...'

(21) kwoip-ka mba-gndeva-n-o
 there-loc stay-pres1pl-TN-SS
 '...there we stayed ...'

(22) osakha hali senine ndave-lepo
 and day Monday return-past1sgfinal
 '...and on Monday I returned'

From (18) to (19) there is a shift from 1pl to 1sg; from (20) to (21) there is a shift back from the 1sg Subject to the 1pl Subject; from (21) to (22) there is again a shift from 1pl to 1sg. Throughout this stretch of discourse the verbs carry SS-markings. In the discourse (18)-(22), the travelling party ('we') is a set of participants treated as one topic. The shifts to one of the members of the set and back are not considered as a change of topic.

Generally in Wambon number-shifts of this type are not considered as a switch of reference, i.e. 'I' is thought to be included in the reference of 'we'. However, in the data which formed the basis for this article⁶ there is one case in which a number-shift from 1sg to 1 pl does count as a switch of reference, marked by DS suffixation. Consider the following discourse which belongs to the same travel story as (14)-(17); (14)-(17) immediately preceded (23)-(26):

(23) nukhe eve nomboneve ndayonge-ka-lepo-n-o
 I STM STM oar-go-past1sg-TN-SS
 '...and as far as I am concerned, I had travelled by canoe ...'

(24) kinum-ngup-ma-lo kinumla-lepo
 sleep-with-verbaliser-SS sleep-past1sgfinal
 '...till I became sleepy and slept.'

(25) ep-ka la-levo
 there-loc sleep-NF1sgDS
 'There I slept ...'

(26) nduno ene-mo-gndeva-n-o
 sago eat-durative-pres1pl-TN-SS
 '...and we were eating sago ...'

(STM = strong Topic marker)

In (25) there is a DS-marking registering the shift from the 1sg Subject in (25) to the 1pl Subject in (26). As a possible explanation for this DS suffix I suggest the following.

(14)-(17)/(23)-(26) are part of a travel narrative in which the travelling party ('we') is the main topic. This topic was introduced in the first sentence of the story as follows:

- (27) Koivo-talome nukho Wemba Mbitemovo Lorelo
 last-year I Wemba Bitemop Lores
 'Last year I, Wemba, Bitemop and Lores, ...'
 nokhove hitulopkup lavi-lo ka-levambo
 we four go down-SS go-pastipifinal
 '...the four of us, we went down river'

Although the individual members are mentioned separately, the set as a whole (*nokhove hitulopkup*, 'the four of us') is introduced and maintained as one discourse-topic. This topical span is broken, but not ended in (23), because the 'we' topical span is continued in (26) by weak identification (person/number and SR identification). Now in (23) one of the members of the set of participants mentioned in (27) is re-introduced and re-established as a separate topic by the explicit mentioning of the participant (*nukhe*, 'I') followed by the markers of strong topicality ('this is the entity I am now going to talk about') *eve* and *nomboneve* (see 2.2.). Thus in (23) a new topical span begins with the 'I'-topic which ends in (25), where the DS-marking on the verb signals the return to the 'we'-topic. So it could be the case that when one member of a set is explicitly singled out and re-introduced as a new topic, this participant counts as a different referent, causing DS-markings. (In (17), the clause preceding (23), we find an SS-marking because the Subject of the following clause is a Strong Topic, whereas the SR mechanism monitors only *Weak Topics*.)

In the data collected thus far there are no instances of 'false' DS-marking, i.e. every DS-suffix corresponds to a change of SubjectTopic in the following clause. There are, however, three instances of 'false' SS-marking in the data which cannot readily be explained within the theory of SR proposed above. Consider the following discourse, which presents one of these instances:

- (28) nda-gndev-o
 return-pres1sg-SS
 '...I returned ...'
 (29) wamip-ka kave ngaluma-lepo
 way-loc man meet-past1sgfinal
 '....(and) on the way I met a man'

WAMBON DISCOURSE

- (30) ngalu-mbelo
 meet-SS
 '...I met (a man)
 (31) evo kave : 'I
 that man
 '... (and) that

Although (31) has a di (evo kave 'that man'), span starts in (29) w maintained from (28) c One could 'save' th is not a *Weak Topic* bu is used (the definite the phase of establish how far does the initi clear criteria for dis maintaining phase, it examples with regard t

2.1.3. Contextual pers.
 Not all discourse-topi maintained and re-estal high degree of involve discourse-topics and d: topical spans and whic have a relatively low c discourse-topics.

For example, in the ling party 'we' introd 'I'-topic, introduced f tained throughout the v clauses, and is not re- stories in Wambon cultu in the very first sente from the perspective of the story is told from target of the contextua 1983: 329-330) for this

- (30) ngalu-mbelo
meet-SS
'...I met (a man)....'
- (31) evo kave : 'Nguve avoko-kap-ndekhe?' ne-mbelo
that man You who-man-quotemarker say-SS
'...(and) that man said: 'Who are you?'

Although (31) has a different Subject(Weak)Topic from the preceding sentences (evo kave 'that man'), there is a SS-suffix on the verb in (30). The kave-topical span starts in (29) where kave 'a man' is introduced as topic. The 'I'-topic is maintained from (28) on by person/number and SR identification.

One could 'save' the theory proposed here by claiming that evo kave in (31) is not a Weak Topic but a Strong Topic, because a relatively strong expression is used (the definite NP evo kave) and because evo kave is arguably used within the phase of establishing topicality. The crucial question is then of course: how far does the initial phase of topical spans extend? As I have not given clear criteria for distinguishing the topic-establishing phase from the topic-maintaining phase, it seems fair to accept cases like (30)/(31) as counter-examples with regard to the theory defended here.

2.1.3. Contextual perspective and switch-reference

Not all discourse-topics have the same importance. Discourse-topics which are maintained and re-established in long stretches of discourse and which have a high degree of involvement in the events of the story, I will label major discourse-topics and discourse-topics which are maintained in relatively short topical spans and which are not or only once or twice re-established and which have a relatively low degree of involvement in the events, I will label minor discourse-topics.

For example, in the discourse (14)-(17)/(23)-(26) discussed above, the travelling party 'we' introduced in (27) is the major discourse-topic, whereas the 'I'-topic, introduced in (23), is the minor one. Whereas the 'we'-topic is maintained throughout the whole story, the 'I'-topical span extends only for four clauses, and is not re-established afterwards. Now one of the rules for telling stories in Wambon culture is that the narrator presents the main discourse-topic in the very first sentence of the story and then narrates the events that follow from the perspective of the main discourse-topic. Thus in (14)-(17)/(23)-(26) the story is told from the perspective of the 'we'. This 'we'-topic is the main target of the contextual perspective of the story (see Itagaki and Prideaux 1983: 329-330) for this notion of contextual perspective and its statistical

the 1sg Subject in (25)
or this DS suffix I sug-

n which the travelling
ed in the first sentence

y, the set as a whole
d maintained as one dis-
d in (23), because the
cation (person/number and
he set of participants
s a separate topic by the
lowed by the markers of
o talk about') eve and
egins with the 'I'-topic
signals the return to the
r of a set is explicitly
dipicant counts as a dif-
use preceding (23), we
clause is a Strong
cs.)

s of 'false' DS-marking,
Topic in the following
SS-marking in the data
SR proposed above. Consider
stances:

relation to the sentence-grammar process of Subject-selection).

In an overwhelming majority of clauses in Wambon narratives the main discourse-topic is selected as Subject. This fits into the Functional Grammar interpretation of Subjects as presenting the point of view or perspective on the state of affairs designated by predications (cf. Dik 1978: 71). In this way the narrator expresses on the level of sentence-grammar the dominant contextual perspective of the discourse.

Above I tried to show that both the notion of Subject and that of Topic are indispensable in the formulation of SR rules as they operate in discourse. Now we can formulate the involvement of Subject and Topic as follows: DS-markings signal that the contextual perspective (Subject-notion) is going to switch to another well-established entity about which the speaker is still talking (Weak Topic-notion).

2.2. Strong Topics

Weak Topics trigger rules of SR that help the hearer to keep track of well-established discourse-topics medially in topical spans. In this section we will look at discourse-topics which occur initially in topical spans and which are strongly identified (Strong Topics). Wambon has two expressive devices to express Strong Topics: the Strong Topic-construction and the Strong Topic markers (STM's) *eve* and *nomboneve*.

2.2.1. The Strong Topic-construction

Consider the following examples:

- (32) Nguve nga-hile keno-nde
you your-name what-Focus
'What is your name?'

- (33) Evo kave nekhon-oye ndominuk
that man his-pig one
'That man has one pig'

(32) can be paraphrased as: 'I am going to ask something about you, viz. what is your name?' and (33) as: 'I am going to say something about that man, viz. that he has one pig.' In this construction the speaker first establishes his (Strong) Topic and then goes on to make a statement or a question about that Topic. In Indonesian we find a similar construction, which is very frequent in that language, and also in Dutch. In Dutch the construction is very rare in the written,

WAMBON DISCOURSE

formal language, but

Indonesian:

- (34) Perempuan itu
woman that
'That woman'

Dutch:

- (35) Die man z':
that man hi:
'That man's'

In Wambon, Indonesian
integrated in the f
In Wambon the St
construction exempl

- (36) Evo kave e
that man T
'That man,
(THM = Them

The Theme in (36),
pause-intonation, b
eve. In the Strong
is weakly identify
Topic-construction
tional pattern:

- (37) Strong Topi

The Predicate has c
it. I call pattern
defines the first c

2.2.2. The Strong T
Strong Topichood c
are eve and nombone
following example:

formal language, but very frequent in colloquial spoken language.

Indonesian:

- (34) Perempuan itu anak-nya sakit
woman that child-her ill
'That woman's child is ill'

Dutch:

- (35) Die man z'n vrouw is ziek
that man his wife is ill
'That man's wife is ill'

In Wambon, Indonesian and Dutch the Strong Topic is intonationally very firmly integrated in the following expression.

In Wambon the Strong Topic-construction contrasts with the Theme-Predication-construction exemplified by (36):

- (36) Evo kave eve na nekheve jambolokup
that man ThM PM he ill
'That man, he is ill'
(ThM = Theme-marker)

The Theme in (36), *evo kave*, is separated from the following predication by pause-intonation, by the conventional pause marker *na* and by the Theme-marker *eve*. In the Strong Topic-construction these markers are absent; the Strong Topic is weakly identified by a possessive prefix on the Subject. In Wambon the Strong Topic-construction is restricted to stative clauses and has the following functional pattern:

- (37) Strong Topic x_i + [poss pro x_i + Subj] + Predicate

The Predicate has often, but not obligatorily, the Focus-suffix *-nde* attached to it. I call pattern (37) a Topic-construction because the pattern intrinsically defines the first constituent as the (Strong) Topic.

2.2.2. The Strong Topic-markers *eve* and *nomboneve*

Strong Topic-hood can also be expressed by special markers (STM's). These markers are *eve* and *nomboneve*, which sometimes occur together as in (23). Consider the following example:

- (38) Takhimo-gambat nomboneve Tuhan okh ha-lo ip ha-lo
third-picture STM Lord water make-SS land make-SS
'On the third picture the Lord creates water and land'

(38) could be insightfully paraphrased as 'About the third picture: it shows how the Lord created water and land.'

If *eve* and *nomboneve* are followed by the pause-marker *na* and if the constituent marked by *eve* and *nomboneve* is intonationally separated from the following predication, then that constituent is a Theme. In this respect Wambon resembles Usan, another Papuan language (cf. Reesink 1983b: 228).

The Strong Topic-marker *eve* is also used as independent demonstrative pronoun:

- (39) Eve ngulum-nde
that teacher-Focus
'That is a teacher'

In colloquial Dutch there is a similar frequent use of the resumptive pronouns *die* and *dat* after Strong Topics:

- (40) Jan *die* is gek
John that is crazy
'John, he's crazy'

Nomboneve cannot be used in the function of independent pronoun:

- (41) *Nomboneve ngulum-nde
that teacher-Focus
'That is a teacher'

The clustering of *eve* and *nomboneve*, possible after Strong Topics, is not possible in the independent pronominal use:

- (42) *Nomboneve eve ngulum-nde
that that teacher-Focus
'That is a teacher'

Thus *nomboneve* clearly only functions as Strong Topic-marker, although its pronominal origin is clear, because *nombo* functions (only) as a pronoun:

- (43) Nombo ngulum-nde
this teacher-Focus
'This is a teacher'

WAMBON DISCOURSE

Nomboneve is composed of
'in between'.

3. Focus in Wambon discourse

3.0. Introduction

Wambon has a focal suffix very frequent in conversationality is generally marked frequent in such discourse to what information he discourse the speaker is developing, especially when out the narrative. This narrative but a minor x often consist of one focus

3.1. Neutralization and

In discourse the speaker (the topicality dimension) the pragmatic information (pragmatic information (guage-use.

In the topicality dimension his topic and mentions in the saliency dimension constantly, this saliency and general information sometimes regarded as essentially dependent

Take for example the show that Q-words lose

- (44) A : I hear you
(45) A : Why did you
(46) B : I went there
(47) A : And New York

ha-lo
und make-SS
id land'

bird picture: it shows how

or na and if the constit-
rated from the following
respect Wambon resembles

ient demonstrative pronoun:

the resumptive pronouns

t pronoun:

rong Topics, is not possible

marker, although its pro-
) as a pronoun:

Nomboneve is composed of *nombo* 'this' plus *eve* 'that' (with a transitional nasal in between).

3. Focus in Wambon discourse

3.0. Introduction

Wambon has a focal suffix *-nde* which is not frequent in narrative discourse but very frequent in conversational dialogues. The fact that the development of saliency is generally more complex in dialogues could explain why *-nde* is so frequent in such discourse: the speaker thinks the hearer needs more guidance as to what information he should pick up as salient. On the other hand, in narrative discourse the speaker is more concerned to make clear how the topicality is developing, especially when there is more than one discourse-topic to trace throughout the narrative. This could explain why SR markings play a central role in narrative but a minor role in dialogues, where sentences are much shorter and often consist of one final clause only.

3.1. Neutralization and diversification

In discourse the speaker should make clear not only what he is talking about (the topicality dimension) but also which information is the most important given the pragmatic information of the hearer (the saliency dimension). To change the pragmatic information of the hearer is certainly one of the major goals of language-use.

In the topicality dimension there is a certain continuity (the speaker establishes his topic and maintains it for a certain time) which is completely lacking in the saliency dimension. Which information is salient and which not changes constantly, this saliency being completely dependent on the context, situation and general information at the time of the utterance. Even constituents which are sometimes regarded as inherently salient, such as Q-words, are *qua* saliency essentially dependent on the pragmatic factors just mentioned.

Take for example the exchange (44)-(47) which Hannay (1983: 211) gives to show that Q-words lose their saliency in certain contexts.

- (44) A : I hear you have been to London and New York recently?
(45) A : Why did you go to London?
(46) B : I went there for my sister's wedding
(47) A : And New York?

In (47) the Q-word is left out because it is contextually given and non-salient, whereas in (45) the Q-word is salient. To guide the hearer as to how an expression fits into the development of saliency in the discourse the speaker can assign Focus function to the salient constituents in expressions. This Focus function then triggers expression-rules which give the constituent with Focus a specific form or position. Often the informational make-up of the discourse is so transparent that the speaker does not need to assign Topic and Focus, i.e. only a minority of the discourse-topics get sentence-level expression as Topic and only a minority of the constituents which present salient information are treated as Focus constituents.

In Dik et al. (1981) six types of pragmatic conditions are mentioned which create six types of saliency. One of the contexts they discuss is that of the Q-word question and its answer. Consider the following Wambon exchange:

- (48) Jakhove kenonop-nde takhim-gende?
they what-Focus buy-pres3plfinal
'WHAT do they buy?'
- (49) Ndu-nde takhim-gende
sago-Focus buy-pres3plfinal
'They buy SAGO'

The constituent in (49) that presents the information that fills the blank in the pragmatic information of the speaker of (48) is of course the relatively most salient constituent in this context: that is why *ndu-nde* 'sago' in (49) is marked for Focus by *-nde*. Dik et al. (1981: 63) apply the label 'completive' to this type of pragmatic condition.

In Wambon the same suffix *-nde* appears in another context which Dik et al. (1981: 63) label 'replacing' contexts:

- (50) A : Mbitemop ndune ande-tbo
Bitemop sago eat-past3sgfinal
'Bitemop ate sago'
- (51) B : Woyo, nekheve ndu-nde e-nogma-tbo
No, he sago-Focus eat-Neg-past3sgfinal
'No, he did not eat SAGO'
- (52) B : Nekheve ande-nde ande-tbo
he bananas-Focus eat-past3sgfinal
'He ate BANANAS'

In (51) B rejects a piece of information received from A and in (52) B corrects A's statement by replacing that wrong piece of information and substituting the

WAMBON DISCOURSE

correct information

Thus by using the answers, rejections conditions underlying the suffix *-nde* also

al. 1981: 66 for a

Not all languages such a strongly neutral considerable degree eney caused by difference of Cameroon. Focus mechanism of t useful summary of hi

According to Watt each having a specific expressive devices.

replacing contexts: ferent treatment in Watters 1979: 77). I

Focus: 'that information does not share with assertive Focus: 'th which the hearer ass

The functionality fest itself most cl one deliberately pla creating a contextua

(53) A : Sanop ker
Sanop wha
'WHAT doe

(54) B : Sanop-nde
Sanop-Foc
'SANOP br

The context of (53) c
pressions with a spec
of the expression (54
development of salien

correct information.

Thus by using the same expressive device (-nde) in Q-word questions, their answers, rejections and corrections, Wambon neutralizes the different pragmatic conditions underlying the different types of saliency. As we shall see in 3.2., the suffix -nde also marks salient constituents in parallel contexts (cf. Dik et al. 1981: 66 for a discussion of Parallel Focus).

Not all languages code saliency-constraints onto the form of expressions in such a strongly neutralizing fashion. An example of a language which allows a considerable degree of diversification by distinguishing several types of saliency caused by different pragmatic conditions is Aghem, a Grassfields Bantu language of Cameroon. Watters (1979) has described the complicated and elaborate Focus mechanism of this language in detail, and Dik et al. (1981: 48) give a useful summary of his findings.

According to Watters (1979: 177), Aghem distinguishes six types of Focus, each having a specific informational role. Five of these types have their own expressive devices. Thus different expressive devices are used in completive and replacing contexts: the salient constituents in completive contexts get a different treatment in terms of positioning from those in replacing contexts (cf. Watters 1979: 77). In completive contexts Watters (1979: 177) speaks of Assertive Focus: 'that information which the speaker believes, assumes or knows the hearer does not share with him or her.' In replacing contexts he speaks of Counter-assertive Focus: 'that information which the speaker substitutes for information which the hearer asserted in a previous utterance.'

The functionality of Focus assignment in Wambon conversational discourse manifests itself most clearly in the very strong negative reactions of speakers when one deliberately places the Focus suffix -nde on the wrong constituent, thereby creating a contextual misfit in terms of saliency-constraints:

- (53) A : Sanop kenonop-nde takhim-ge?
 Sanop what-Focus buy-pres3sgfinal
 'WHAT does Sanop buy?'
 (54) B : Sanop-nde ndune takhim-ge
 Sanop-Focus sago buy-pres3sgfinal
 'SANOP buys sago'

The context of (53) constrains (54) informationally in such a way that only expressions with a specific distribution of saliency are acceptable. Now the form of the expression (54) reflects an informational make-up that clashes with the development of saliency in the preceding discourse. Although (54) gives the

lly given and non-salient, hearer as to how an expressive the speaker can assign ons. This Focus function ment with Focus a specific he discourse is so trans- and Focus, i.e. only a pression as Topic and only nformation are treated as ons are mentioned which , discuss is that of the Wambon exchange:

that fills the blank in the urse the relatively most nde 'sago' in (49) is marked el 'completive' to this

context which Dik et al.

nal

A and in (52) B corrects tion and substituting the

information asked for in (53), native speakers reject (54) as an answer to (53). The wrong Focus assignment in (54) creates an unacceptable lack of informational cohesion in the conversational discourse.

3.2. *The relation of topicality to saliency*

In discourse the dimensions of topicality and saliency operate independently and that is why the two dimensions can and do co-occur in one constituent; in certain contexts a discourse-topic becomes informationally important or salient. For example, when weak discourse-topics become involved in contrasts the dimensions of topicality and saliency coincide. Consider the following Wambon exchange:

- (55) A : Nombone ndu-ngup ande-ngup?
this sago-and bananas-and
'What about this sago and bananas?'
- (56) B : Wembane ndu-nde takhima-tbo, Karolule ande-nde
Wemba sago-Focus buy-past3sgfinal Karolule bananas-Focus
takhima-tbo
buy-past3sgfinal
'Wemba bought SAGO, and Kalorus BANANAS'

In (56) *ndu-nde* and *ande-nde* are weak discourse-topics, introduced as the topics of conversation in (55). At the same time they are involved in the parallel contrast of (56) (cf. Dik et al. 1981: 66 for this notion of parallel contrastive saliency). *Wemba* and *Karolule* are also involved in the parallel contrast and they are also salient constituents in (56). However, their saliency is not formally expressed, because in Wambon only one constituent per predication can receive Focus function. In the context of (55) the contrast between the sago and the bananas is in the center of attention: they, and not the pair *Wemba/Karolule*, form the main contrast.

In contrastive saliency the given-new informational opposition is completely irrelevant. For example the following English parallel contrast can be used in various types of contexts:

- (57) JOHN bought a CAR and MARY a BIKE

(57) can be used as an answer to the following questions:

- (58) WHAT did John and Mary buy?

- (59) I know John and Mary bought a car and a bike but WHO bought WHAT?

WAMBON DISCOURSE

As an answer to (58) CAR are given information. Ha caused by newness of info factors such as contrast) (58) as both Assertive Focus given-new opposition is i Assertive Focus is superfluous

Because of the strong class of Focus assignment Topic with given information do with topicality caused interpret Topic and Focus at least to define them i stituent. Hannay (1983) f it is restricted to new i tors such as emphasis and predication-internal pragmatic

As we have seen, however independently in discourse these discourse-dimension relation. If we define pragmatic informational role and ex Topic and Focus whenever constituent. If one intermedially in topical spans Weak Topics (and not as a of the expression of Topicality

- (60) What about Rebecca
(61) It was to HER that

In (61) HER is a Weak Topic use of pronominal identification (emphatic saliency), its tion and by intonational Consider also the following

: (54) as an answer to (53).
table lack of informational

y operate independently and
one constituent; in cer-
ly important or salient.
ed in contrasts the dimen-
he following Wambon exchange:

ule ande-nde
ule bananas-focus

s, introduced as the topics
volved in the parallel con-
n of parallel contrastive
a parallel contrast and they
saliency is not formally
predication can receive
etween the sago and the
the pair *Wemba/Karolulu*,

l opposition is completely
l contrast can be used in

ans:

ut WHO bought WHAT?

As an answer to (58) CAR and BIKE in (57) are new, and as an answer to (59) they are given information. Hannay (1983: 210) distinguishes Assertive Focus (saliency caused by newness of information) from Emphatic Focus (saliency caused by other factors such as contrast) and then specifies CAR and BIKE in (57) as an answer to (58) as both Assertive Focus and Emphatic Focus. As we have seen, however, the given-new opposition is irrelevant in these cases. Therefore the specification Assertive Focus is superfluous.

Because of the strong association of Focus with new information (an important class of Focus assignments having to do with saliency caused by newness) and of Topic with given information (an important class of Topic assignments having to do with topicality caused by prior mentioning (Weak Topics)), it is tempting to interpret Topic and Focus in terms of the dichotomous given-new distinction, or at least to define them in such a way that they can never coincide on one constituent. Hannay (1983) for example suggests redefining Focus in such a way that it is restricted to new information; for cases of saliency caused by other factors such as emphasis and contrast he proposes the introduction of a third predication-internal pragmatic function Emphasis.

As we have seen, however, the dimensions of saliency and topicality operate independently in discourse and this means that Topic and Focus as reflections of these discourse-dimensions on sentence-level in principle have a non-dichotomous relation. If we define pragmatic functions (as proposed in 1.1.) in terms of both informational role and expressive devices, we have a clear case of coincidence of Topic and Focus whenever the expressive devices of both functions co-occur in one constituent. If one interprets the use of anaphoric pronouns to maintain topics medially in topical spans as a sentence-grammar-determined process to express Weak Topics (and not as a discourse-level phenomenon), then there is a coincidence of the expression of Topic and Focus in the following examples:

(60)

What about Rebecca? (= Hannay 1983: 214, no. 34/35)

(61)

It was to HER that John gave his most precious painting

In (61) *HER* is a Weak Topic; established in (60), expressed as Weak Topic by the use of pronominal identification. At the same time *HER* is a salient constituent (emphatic saliency), its saliency being expressed by the use of a Focus-construction and by intonational prominence.

Consider also the following example from Indonesian:

- (62) Memang dari semua abdi dalem yang paling menarik ada-lah mereka
really of all serf royal who most attractive are-Focus they
yang ber-tugas melayani keluarga raja
who to-have-as-task to-serve family king
'Really of all the royal serfs those who serve the royal family have
the most attractive position'
- (63) MEREKA-LAH yang paling dekat dengan raja
they-Focus who most close to king
'THEY are the ones that are most close to the king'

In (62) *abdi dalem* has been established as topic. In (63) this topic becomes salient, its saliency being expressed by the Focus-suffix *-lah*. The topicality is expressed by the use of weak pronominal identification. Hannay (1983: 220) proposes to give constituents like *mereka-lah* in (63), *HER* in (61) and *ndu-nde* in (56) the functional specification Topic/Emphasis. For Wambon and Indonesian, and probably also for English, this proposal would mean the grammar distinguishing two functions Emphasis and Focus, both expressed by the same devices (Wambon uses *-nde* in all saliency contexts, and Indonesian uses *-lah* analogously), whereas at the same time the informational roles associated with Emphasis and Focus would have a striking feature in common, which neither shares with Topic, viz. the informational property of saliency. Thus the introduction of the function Emphasis would mean a considerable complication of the grammars of Wambon and Indonesian.

Hannay (1983: 219) notes as a consequence of accepting the possibility of Topic and Focus coinciding on one constituent 'that one would have to make explicit that only the specific combination of Topic and emphatic Focus was possible, which further necessitates the acknowledgement of two levels, or layers, of Focus assignment.' I have argued above (cf. the examples (57)-(59)) that in the examples Hannay adduces to support the two-level distinction of Assertive Focus and Emphatic Focus the specification Assertive Focus is superfluous because of the irrelevance of the given-new distinction in contrastive saliency. That (Weak) Topics and Assertive Focus (newness-Focus) never coincide is simply a consequence of the fact that information cannot be at the same time given and new, and for the same reason there is no need to state specifically in the grammar the possibility of Topic and Emphatic Focus coinciding, because any type of information (topical or not, given or new) can become salient in emphatic and contrastive contexts. The given-new distinction is thus not essential to the nature of Topic and Focus; that the dimensions of topicality and saliency do not interact when the topical information is given and the salient information new

WAMBON DISCOURSE

does not mean that it is in to interact.

Although the given-new (the informational make-up, course-distinction is syntactico-morphological process the given-new dichotomy, markers, etc.) into notions of Topic and Focus Given-New to the sentence-restricted to either the N Topic and Focus be affected

4. Concluding remarks

The subject of this article in Wambon discourse, their grammar.

Cohesion constraints of the notion of topical maintaining and re-establishing medially in topical spans or person/number-suffixation labeled 'Weak Topics' and strongly identified (full

We have seen that Wambon Topics. Weak Topics can be that has previously been (the informational role of ing about the same entity terms of expressive device SR-suffixes. Strong Topics speaker establishes or int say something about'), and as Strong Topics by the St

SR suffixes, triggered markers, and the Strong Topic, now guide the hearer

ada-lah mereka
ve are-Focus they

e royal family have

g'

this topic becomes
-lah. The topicality
. Hannay (1983: 220)
R in (61) and ndu-nde
Wambon and Indonesian,
he grammar distinguish-
he same devices (Wambon
lah analogously),
ed with Emphasis and
her shares with Topic,
roduction of the func-
he grammars of Wambon

the possibility of
ould have to make ex-
phatic Focus was pos-
two levels, or layers,
es (57)-(59)) that in
inction of Assertive
s is superfluous because
stive saliency. That
oincide is simply a
same time given and
pecifically in the gram-
g, because any type of
ient in emphatic and
not essential to the
ity and saliency do not
llient information new

does not mean that it is inherent to the nature of topicality and saliency not to interact.

Although the given-new opposition is clearly relevant to the description of the informational make-up of discourse, it remains to be seen whether this discourse-distinction is systematically reflected in sentential structures and syntactico-morphological processes. And even if we did find languages which express the given-new dichotomy on clause-level by breaking up clauses (by introduction, markers, etc.) into new and given parts, this would not affect the notions of Topic and Focus; rather we would have to add a pragmatic notion Given-New to the sentence-grammar. Only if Topic or Focus assignment were restricted to either the New or Given domain of the clause, would the theory of Topic and Focus be affected.⁷

4. Concluding remarks

The subject of this article has been the dimensions of topicality and saliency in Wambon discourse, their interrelation and their reflection in Wambon sentence-grammar.

Cohesion constraints connected with topicality have been formulated in terms of the notion of topical span; topical spans reflect the cycle of establishing, maintaining and re-establishing topics in discourse. Discourse-topics occurring medially in topical spans which are weakly identified (for example by pronouns or person/number-suffixation on verbs or switch-reference morphology) have been labeled 'Weak Topics' and those which occur initially in topical spans and are strongly identified (full NP's, proper names), 'Strong Topics'.

We have seen that Wambon grammar formally distinguishes Weak Topics and Strong Topics. Weak Topics can be defined as constituents which present information that has previously been established as topic and that is now maintained as such (the informational role of Weak Topics can be paraphrased as: 'I am still speaking about the same entity I established a few utterances ago as my topic.'). In terms of expressive devices, Weak Topics are constituents that are monitored by SR-suffixes. Strong Topics are constituents which present information that the speaker establishes or introduces as his topic ('this is the entity I want to say something about'), and occur initially in topical spans; they are signalled as Strong Topics by the Strong Topic-construction and the Strong Topic-markers.

SR suffixes, triggered by the assignment of Weak Topic and Strong Topic-markers, and the Strong Topic-construction, triggered by the assignment of Strong Topic, now guide the hearer as to how expressions fit into the development of

topicality in the preceding discourse. The distribution of SR suffixes is the result of the interaction of pragmatic and syntactic factors. The Functional Grammar model, which distinguishes the notion of Topic from that of Subject, can formulate this interaction in a straightforward way by giving constituents which are monitored by SR-suffixation the functional specification SubjectTopic. (= Weak Topic); these constituents are then distinguished from constituents with the specification Subject or Topic which do not trigger SR-suffixation. Both notions, Subject and Topic, are essential to the formulation of the Wambon SR mechanism: in functionalist terms the contribution of Topic is the maintenance of discourse-topics and that of Subject the expression of the contextual perspective on sentence-level. Thus DS suffixes indicate that there will be a change of contextual perspective from one well-established discourse-topic to another in the following clause.

As far as the dimension of saliency is concerned, the Wambon Focus-suffix *-nde* guides the hearer as to how the expression fits into the development of saliency of the preceding discourse. The differences in pragmatic conditions causing the saliency are all neutralized by the Wambon Focus system: the suffix *-nde* marks Focus constituents in completive, replacing and parallel contexts. In this respect Wambon and Aghem form two typological extremes: Aghem distinguishes formally five types of Focus in five different pragmatic conditions.

The following general picture of pragmatic functions emerges from the present article. The development of the pragmatic information in the discourse preceding an utterance constrains the informational make-up of that utterance in terms of two dimensions: saliency and topicality. These dimensions operate independently in discourse. Topic and Focus trigger rules of sentence-grammar which reflect, in a largely neutralizing fashion, informational discourse-constraints on the form of linguistic expressions. Pragmatic functions thus have a mediating position between discourse and sentence-grammar: on the one hand their assignment depends completely on the discourse-factors of context, situation and general information, on the other hand they trigger the expression-rules of sentence-grammar.

In this respect the present position of pragmatic functions in the model of Functional Grammar is the right one. If the proposal of Nuyts (1983: 384) to remove the pragmatic functions to 'a deeper position in the grammar' were to mean positioning these functions outside sentence-grammar proper (and in the light of De Schutter and Nuyts 1983a, 392, 393 who speak of a pre-verbal pragmatics this seems to be the case), this point of contact between discourse and sentence-grammar would be destroyed.

WAMBON DISCOURSE

As far as the relation now and then these directions discourse-topic gets into a non-dichotomous relation. It also topical parts. It also dichotomous relation. the expressive devices and Focus will be four and Focus. Of course new information, the function is not essential being Topic and Focus. Many problems have following: the interest Grammar formalism, the sentences (cf. the fact ready has to decide or the formalization of tactical relations between like (65):

Indonesian:

- (64) Perempuan itu
woman that
'That woman's
- (65) Anak perempuan
child woman
'The child of

NOTES

- 1 Switch-reference is widespread phenomenon the verbs carry a clause is the same
- 2 In the classification Austronesian) Trar Ayu-Dumut family. is a low degree of of these two dialect Lexico-statist Wambon and Yonggon

SR suffixes is the s. The Functional that of Subject, can ng constituents which n SubjectTopic. (= Weak titutents with the ixation. Both notions, Wambon SR mechanism: ntenance of discourse- perspective on sen- change of contextual other in the following

mbon Focus-suffix -nde velopment of saliency nditions causing the e suffix -nde marks nttexts. In this re- distinguishes form- ons.

ges from the present e discourse preceding tterance in terms of perate independently mmar which reflect, onstraints on the ve a mediating posi- a their assignment ation and general rules of sentence-

ons in the model of s (1983: 384) to grammar' were to oper (and in the a pre-verbal prag- wween discourse and

As far as the relation between saliency and topicality is concerned, every now and then these dimensions coincide on one constituent, for example when a discourse-topic gets involved in contrast. This means that these dimensions have a non-dichotomous relation: utterances cannot simply be broken into salient and topical parts. It also means that Topic and Focus have in principle a non-dichotomous relation. However, if these functions are also defined in terms of the expressive devices connected with them, a clear case of coincidence of Topic and Focus will be found when a constituent exhibits the expression of both Topic and Focus. Of course when Topic is assigned to given information and Focus to new information, the two cannot possibly coincide, but since the given-new distinction is not essential to Topic and Focus, this is not a consequence of their being Topic and Focus.

Many problems have been left untouched in this article. Among these are the following: the interesting question how to formalize SR rules in the Functional Grammar formalism, the consequences of SR phenomena for the theory of processing sentences (cf. the fact that the speaker in producing verb forms in Wambon already has to decide on the selection of a SubjectTopic of the following clause), the formalization of Strong Topic rules, the problem of the pragmatic and syntactic relations between Strong Topic-constructions like (64) and constructions like (65):

Indonesian:

(64) Perempuan itu anak-nya sakit
woman that child-her ill
'That woman's child is ill'

(65) Anak perempuan itu sakit
child woman that ill
'The child of that woman is ill'

NOTES

¹ Switch-reference is the commonly-used label in Papuan linguistics for the widespread phenomenon in Papuan languages whereby, in consecutive clauses, the verbs carry affixes that indicate that the Subject of the following clause is the same or different from the Subject of the preceding clause.

² In the classification of Voorhoeve (1975), Wambon is as a member of the (non-Austronesian) Trans-New Guinea Phylum, more specifically a member of the Awyu-Dumut family. It has two main dialects, Digul-Wambon and Yonggom. There is a low degree of mutual intelligibility between speakers from the centers of these two dialects.

Lexico-statistically there is 47% cognatic correspondence between Digul-Wambon and Yonggom. There are striking differences in the grammars of both

dialects. Possibly Yonggom should be classified as member of the Dumut-subfamily and Digul-Wambon as member of the Wyu-subfamily (Voorhoeve 1975: 27, 28). In this article it is Digul-Wambon that is described. Drabbe (1959) sketches the grammar and phonology of Yonggom, which he terms Wambon.

3 See section 1.2. for the distinction between discourse-topic and sentence-topic.

4 Examples like (6) which show the influence of stylistic factors were brought to my attention by Simon Dik, who was kind enough to offer some comments on an earlier version of this article.

5 This speaker was Ahitup Kerenggere, a Wambon native speaker from Manggelum, who helped me to learn and describe his language. Having had six years of Indonesian primary school, he was sufficiently bilingual to assist in the task of recording and transcribing the travel narratives discussed in the present article.

6 The corpus consisted of about 300 clauses of travel narrative.

7 In my discussion of Hannay (1983), I have concentrated on the relation between Focus and given-new, but the same line of reasoning can be applied to the relation between Topic and given-new:

- a. Topics can be either given or new (cf. the Strong Topic examples (34), (35) and (38), all of which can be used to refer to newly introduced information about which the speaker wants to say something);
- b. just as an important subclass of Focus assignments is related to new information (Assertive Focus), so a frequent subclass of Topic assignments is related to given information (Weak Topics).

Chapter 12

Parentheticals a

Yael Ziv

Department of English, Hebrew

1. Background and introduction

Despite occasional reference al' has not, in fact, been notion is implicitly regulatory or, alternatively, a discourse function, namely that which is communicative unit is conceived of sense is external to the serve as the point of departure

This paper will concern of the class(es) of parentheticals with appropriate to try to in Grammar (FG) since FG is means of communication a which, in addition, strive to be able to account for the ever, there is, to the parentheticals; consequently, and examine its consequences

2. General characterization

Formally, the class of parentheticals (however), a honest), -ing clauses (clauses (what's more) a Quirk et al. 1972).

Phonologically, it is tone unit from the sentence case, as is evident from